

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,600	08/08/2005	Nicolas Aurio	N-32529A	7126
1095 NOVARTIS	7590 03/26/200	EXAMINER		
CORPORATE	INTELLECTUAL PRO	KOSAR, AARON J		
	ONE HEALTH PLAZA 104/3 EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080			PAPER NUMBER
2.131 111110	. 21,, 1.0 0, 700 1000		1609	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 T	DAVS	. 03/26/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/516,600	AURIO ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Aaron J. Kosar	1609			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicati or Reply	on appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence add	dress		
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILInsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutony re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMU CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, ma- tion. y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) N y statute, cause the application to become	NICATION. y a reply be timely filed MONTHS from the mailing date of this co e ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>08/08/2005</u> .				
•	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5) 6) 7)	Claim(s) <u>19-51</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) <u>19-51</u> are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)[] 10)[]	The specification is objected to by the ExThe drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[ Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abe correction is required if the draw	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ing(s) is objected to. See 37 CF			
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		ew Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date			
3) Infor	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-smation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date		of Informal Patent Application			

# DETAILED ACTION

#### Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

2. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

**Group I**, claim(s) 19-21, is drawn to methods of making compositions using protein and fiber.

Group II, claim(s) 29, 38,41,44,47 are drawn to methods of making compositions using proteinfiber compositions

Group III, claim(s) 22-28,30-37,39-40,42-43,45-46 are drawn to protein-fiber compositions.

Group IV, claim(s) 48,50-51 are drawn to methods of using protein-fiber compositions.

3. The *inventions* listed as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The groups read upon the combination of a protein and fiber; however, the method of making and using and compositions comprising protein and fiber have been previously reported in the prior art of BELL, *et al.* (USPAT# 6210686). Bell teaches methods of making and using a cholesterol level effecting composition (column 3, lines 50-62) that comprises fibers (column 1, lines 44-58; column 3, lines 50-53) and protein (column 5, lines 34-41); therefore, with regards to the invention groups, unity of invention is lacking.

### **Election of Species**

4. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

If Applicant elects claims group I, II, III, or IV above, Applicant must also elect species from each of the following species groups:

- A. fiber is generic to the species: konjac gum, locust bean gum, tare bean gum, gum tragacanth, karaya gum, xanthan gum, arable gum, arable gum, guar gum, gellan gum, pectin, β-glucan, mucilage, and carrageenan. The species are structurally distinct, one from another, such that they, and the compositions which they comprise, would be expected to function differently, particularly in vivo. Additionally, the search for one species would not necessarily lead to the discovery of another, and thus would pose an undue burden to search the species together; therefore, Applicant is required to select a single species for initial prosecution of the claims.
- B. protein is generic to the species: wheat protein, egg protein, collagen, whey protein, casein, soy protein, pea protein, muscle protein, gluten, fibrillar protein, silk protein, and hydrolysates thereof. For the sake of compact prosecution, Examiner is interpreting the species "5 hydrolysates" (claim 19) as a typographical error of the originally disclosed "hydrolysates". The species are structurally distinct, one from another, such that they, and the compositions which they comprise, would be expected to function differently, particularly in vivo. Additionally, the search for one species would not necessarily lead

to the discovery of another, and thus would pose an undue burden to search the species together; therefore, Applicant is required to select a *single* species for initial prosecution of the claims.

If Applicant elects claims group II, III, or IV above, Applicant must also elect species from the following species group:

- C. metabolic syndrome, diabetes and lowering blood cholesterol are distinct species. The fiber-protein combinations required to treat these distinct conditions would further comprise distinct drugs, different targets, and different modes of action. The conditions are mutually exclusive and a search of one condition would not necessarily lead to the discovery of the other conditions; therefore, Applicant is required to select a single species for initial prosecution of the claims.
- 5. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:
  - a. Species groups A and B are claimed by claims 19-51.
  - b. Species group C is claimed by claims 29-51.
- 6. The following claim(s) are generic: Claim 19.
- 7. The *species* listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The groups read upon the combination of a protein and fiber; however, the method of using and compositions comprising protein and fiber have been previously reported in the prior art of Bell, *et al.* (USPAT# 6210686); therefore, unity of invention is lacking among the species.
- 6. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify

the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

#### Conclusion

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron J. Kosar whose telephone number is (571) 270-3054. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30AM-5:00PM, ALT. Friday, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mary Mosher can be reached on (571) 272-0235. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system: Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aaron Kosar Patent Examiner

> ZACHARIAH LUCAS PATENT EXAMINER

Page 6